Work Group 163: Supply Chain Reporting and Invoicing

8/5/14 Meeting Notes

Industry Lead: Bob Rosser, IWCO Direct, PostCom; USPS Lead: Randy Workman, Business Mailer Support

Agenda

- Review Feedback from last meeting
- Review Consensus from last week on Uniqueness Solution Type Needed
- Discuss Concept Data Table Proposal
  - o Discuss potential solution
  - o Open discussion
- Next Meeting's Discussion Items

Bob R asked the group if there was any feedback on last week's Uniqueness Discussion proposal. He summarized that the prior week's meeting appeared to have consensus that a static Data Reference Table for Container, Handling Unit, and Piece Uniqueness Management was the direction.

Bob R then displayed a draft of a data table concept to identify the Primary and Secondary MID Owner for each mailing unit being measured (i.e. Container, HU, and Piece). Definitions were supplied based on prior Supply Chain discussions. Bob R suggested that the eDoc Submitter could be responsible to upload and maintain.

When it came to responsibility for accuracy of the data supplied to USPS there was strong disagreement based on the realities of the marketplace. Phil Thompson said that they frequently have no idea who manages the uniqueness on the files they receive from clients. The client can change List Processing companies and there is no communication of a change. They like other printers have no control over the uniqueness of the IMb that they may see from many clients.

Another situation that Lynda Hurley had mentioned was the Mail Owner who provides a range of IMbs from the same MID to several printers and then each Printer is to manage the uniqueness within their assigned range. Another situation brought up was that on much of the Standard Mail that may go to MSPs for additional services like commingling. They frequenting are finding that many of the printers producing this mail are not educated on requirements.

Only the Mail Owner knows who could potentially be managing uniqueness on their MID. Instead of Secondary MID Owner, "Uniqueness Manager" may be a better way to identify those parties in the Supply Chain that may have a role in maintaining uniqueness for piece, Handling Units, and Containers.

Bob G said that many smaller mailers are not technically savvy and will have difficulty with this unless the Industry and USPS build tools and help with the Outreach to educate. Software vendors may be able to generate defaults and populate data with their company identified as "uniqueness Manager" for many small mailings that all use some kind of software to produce the IMb Full Service mailings.

Bob G said if this whole reporting, errors, electronic documentation is too complex, then the small to medium size mailers are going to have a real struggle.

Steve Colella asked how the USPS would use this proposed Uniqueness Responsibility Data Table. Bob R suggested that scorecards might eventually reflect what the eDoc Submitter controls and those errors

only within a threshold vs the current state that shows all errors attributed to the eDoc Submitter. USPS could use the data to report a Scorecard by Uniqueness Manager CRIDs that enable those organizations and the USPS to better identify systemic issues vs. isolated ones. At a minimum, this would aid in dispute resolution.

Steve commented that he didn't see USPS wanting to bill third parties vs . the eDoc Submitter. Phil Thompson understood Steve's perspective. Phil said that we can't forget that this is all about improving quality. With the goal to improve the overall quality, then all the participants in the Supply Chain responsible have to have some skin in the game.

The Group had general consensus that the concept made sense as a solution. Angelo added that Uniqueness Managers who may no longer be doing business or maintaining files for the Primary MID owner have to have the ability to remove themselves as responsible for a specific MID as of a specific date. Many changes happen upstream that eDoc Submitters are not part of. They are frequently unaware of any change events or Supply Chain player substitutes driven by the Primary MID owner.

Joe Bailey wasn't 100% sure how this table would work in certain mailing environments where there could be many active combinations. Others didn't see the same issue. The issue is not that dynamic.

That prompted discussion on other scenarios for the Primary MID owner is the Mailer who works through an agency who does production with a printer and finally to the MSP who is also the eDoc submitter for commingling. The eDoc Submitter has no idea who is managing Uniqueness. That is another example of why the Primary MID owner must submit and maintain that information for the USPS.

The group talked about ideas for where to implement the solution. Angelo suggested it may be on PostalOne! where MID/CRID information is obtained and maintained. Paula Stoskopf suggested that one change would be that Uniqueness errors track back to the MID owner instead of the eDoc Submitter as a scorecard change.

Bob R said that he and Randy would write this up as one of the group's recommendations. The next topic for 163 to explore for the next meeting is eInduction and mis-shipped errors based on the last WG 138 meeting. Dave Myers suggested that the current direction of errors being charged back to the eDoc Submitter doesn't make much sense from both a legal and operational point of view.

Bob R said the group should have all seen an invite from Randy for the MTAC Face to Face 163 meeting on Tuesday morning 7/19/14 at 11 am EST before the MTAC Stakeholders meeting Tuesday afternoon. It will be held in Room 1P619.